



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

nations, with possibility then that the world's uncivilization, seizing the opportunity as before, will surge and struggle again for the mastery. The other way is for the civilized peoples, with uplifted hands and solemn oaths, to bind themselves in a League of Good Faith to limit armaments, to arbitrate disputes, to rely on international courts and international police, to cease from swagger and to trust more to forces of character. Of necessity there would be risks, as there are in all forms of trust; but also for each such risk the protecting arm of the League. Is not this the sole other way? "But not to-day this!" Perhaps not; yet, after more madness and deeper exhaustion, what other way will there be than, weary and bleeding, to at last come together and covenant thus?

But to-day this—were we brave! And of all the peoples, we of America, in the cool of our distance and safety, might begin to-morrow to inaugurate sanity. Is there no one yonder in Washington now who will save us from joining in Europe's mad race, her disastrous delusion? No one to remove from the Capitol that shameful ideal so recently placed there—of a Jesus armed to the teeth as the Prince of Peace and Goodwill? No one who will bid our young nation awake to its mission and lead the world on towards what may deserve the name "Civilization?"

How to Secure a Just Peace.

BY PROF. CHARLES M. MEAD, LL. D.

The address of ex-Secretary Root at the dinner given in his honor by the Peace Society of the City of New York, as reported in the April *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, is for the most part an admirable statement of the causes of war and of the best methods of preserving peace. But in what he says upon the relation of peace to justice one fails to find quite the right conclusion. "Peace," he says, "can never be except as it is founded upon justice." And then he goes on to urge that "we should promote and insist upon the willingness of our country to do justice to all countries of the earth." And then he further sets forth the mischievousness of a popular feeling which is not willing "to recognize the fact that there is some right on the other side," and goes on to remark that "if the people of two countries want to fight, they will find an excuse, a pretext," and that what is needed in order to prevent war is a kindly, benevolent feeling between the nations.

All this is very well and very true, and can hardly be enforced too much. But there is, after all, an implication in it that the only effectual preventive of war is such a moral training of the nations as will make impossible those international jealousies and suspicions which are the fruitful source of international conflicts. And we know only too well how hard and how slow that training must be. Is there no way of averting wars until that millennial state is reached? It seems strange that Secretary Root, who has negotiated so many arbitration treaties, should have said nothing about them as a means of settling disputes between nations. His opening proposition, that "peace can never be except as it is founded on justice," at once suggests the question, How, in each case of dispute or friction, is it to be determined what the justice of the case really is? In point of fact each

nation is naturally inclined to think itself to be in the right; and Mr. Root speaks of no method of settling the quarrel except diplomacy. And yet he says that in such a case "it is the duty of the diplomatic representatives to argue each the cause of his own country." That is, like lawyers arguing for their clients, each nation is bound—as it certainly is naturally inclined—to insist on the justice of its own cause. Now, although diplomacy may, and often does, suffice to remove international friction, yet it is obvious that, so long as the negotiators are confessedly and almost necessarily one-sided and partial, each committed to the side of his own government, there is small chance of pure justice being ascertained and carried out as the result of the diplomatic controversy. In the case of lawyers arguing in court, this one-sidedness is a recognized fact, and there is a judge or jury to decide between them. What is needed in international controversies is obviously a similar impartial tribunal to determine what the just solution is,—in short, arbitration.

This proposition, that peace should be founded on justice, or that justice is more important than peace, has been a favorite maxim of President Roosevelt. It has a captivating sound, and seems indeed almost axiomatic. But as he has used it there has always been an implication that, in a case of international dispute of our own, *we* are to decide where justice lies. He has assumed that the United States can never be guilty of injustice; that, if any other nation has a quarrel with us, it must be in the wrong, and therefore that we need always to be ready to maintain our cause by force. Hence his battleship mania. This attitude was strikingly conspicuous when Colombia, deeming that her rights had been infringed by our conduct respecting Panama, asked that the case might be referred to arbitrators. Our government refused to accede to this on the ground that such a reference would imply on our part an acknowledgment that we had perhaps done wrong, a confession that would be inconsistent with our dignity as a nation!

Of course every other nation has an equal right to assume that it can never do wrong, and to refuse to resort to arbitration. But if all take this attitude, then no arbitration is possible; and equally true is it that the establishment of justice as a basis of peace is also impossible. In the case of a quarrel between two nations, if it is to be justly settled, there is no sure way of this being done except by arbitration. It is ridiculous to hold that either one of two parties to a controversy is fitted to pass a definite sentence on the intrinsic merits of the controversy. It is, if possible, still more ridiculous to hold that a war between the two nations can decide which is in the right. It decides only which nation has the strongest army or the most skillful leaders. If justice is the only sound basis of peace, then international justice must be secured in the same way as justice in the case of quarrels between individuals—by appealing to the judgment of disinterested and intelligent arbitrators.

And arbitration, in order to be universally effective as a promoter of peace, must be allowed to take full cognizance of the subjects of controversy. To provide, as is so largely done in arbitration treaties, that arbitration shall not be resorted to when a nation's *honor* is involved, is a provision which always makes it possible for either of the parties to evade its duty. "Honor" is of so vague meaning that anything can be alleged to affect it. The

case of Colombia *versus* the United States, above mentioned, is a striking example. Our honor, it was affirmed, was touched by the very implication that we perhaps had done wrong! And that reply came from a nation that had been guilty of centuries of wrong to Indians and Negroes, and had waged the iniquitous Mexican and Philippine wars! By all means let us strive and pray for peace founded on righteousness — not on self-righteousness.

New Haven, Conn.

Manifesto of the German Peace Society to the Members of the Reichstag and the Friends of Peace in General.

The Imperial government is demanding five hundred millions of marks in new taxes. In view of the increased cost of provisions and of living in general,—a result of the increased tariff duties,—the German people cannot take upon them this new burden. The taxes exacted by the municipality and by the state are heavy, almost overwhelming, and an increase of these, already determined upon in Prussia, is in preparation in the other states.

Thousands of citizens are obliged to struggle hard for their existence, so that everywhere a powerful opposition is manifesting itself against the new projects of taxation. The opposition is the same, whether it is a question of taxes on inheritances or on fortunes, on wine, beer, gas, electricity or advertisements in the papers.

We therefore pray the deputies in the Reichstag to refuse, for the moment, the proposed financial scheme, for the necessity of such large taxes has not yet been sufficiently demonstrated. So far, the granting of new credits has almost always been made to the detriment of the German people, and has served only to increase the military and naval budgets.

In 1897 these expenses had already reached the enormous sum of 585,000,000 (marks) for the army of the empire, 117,000,000 for the navy and 58,000,000 for the imperial pensions; in all, 760,000,000. To-day the expenditures for the army are 774,000,000, those for the navy 301,000,000, those for pensions 115,000,000; in all, 1,190,000,000. The budget has therefore, in eleven years, increased 130,000,000. Outside of this burdensome increase of the taxes, we have to our charge a considerable imperial debt which is essentially unproductive.

Articles of food and homesteads are burdened with formidable taxes. The price of grain has increased about fifty marks a "ton" as a result of the tariff duties, which, added to the increased cost of other articles of food, makes an increase of seventy marks per family per year. But the taxes are also very high on homesteads. The acquisition of a piece of ground and a building is, under various forms of tax, burdened to the extent of two per cent; and since in hundreds of thousands of cases the purchaser, by reason of his small fortune, even if he spends practically the whole of it on the purchase, can raise only a fifth or sixth part of the purchase money, the burden of tax falling upon him rises often to ten per cent. of what he is worth. Nearly all direct taxes fall upon the homestead; so that in South Germany the municipal taxes in very many cases are from four to six times as

much as the state taxes. The greater part also of the income tax must be borne by the property revenue. This condition extends to the small peasant holders and to the small and middle-class artisans, while in North Germany such great additions to the state income tax must be raised for the municipal needs that in many places these latter are twice as much as the former or more.

Under these circumstances, the resistance to further enormous taxes is as comprehensible as it is justified. We must find another means for remedying our conditions, namely, a material reduction of expenditures. This will be possible in many ways, most of all in the military and naval expenses. Here hundreds of millions may be saved.

A war among the great civilized European States has now become almost an impossibility. More than thirty-four millions of our population must at the present time live from industry, trade and commerce. For these the undisturbed importation of the means of existence and of raw materials, possible only in time of peace, and the exportation of manufactured goods to all parts of the world, which can only be carried on adequately in time of peace, have become an absolute necessity. A war, which would not only take from us these possibilities of gain, but also impose upon us immeasurable sacrifices in blood and treasure, would of necessity bring us into a frightful state of impoverishment, the result of which would almost inevitably be revolution among the suffering masses and complete collapse in every direction.

Similar conditions exist also in England, where multitudes of men can find no remunerative labor, because the opening up of new business enterprises is greatly hampered by the prevailing political mistrust and the burdens of armaments. France also is in pressing need of quiet. The French workingmen, the peasants and likewise the well-to-do classes of the citizens are for the most part opposed to any European war, and they know how to make their wish felt. There is no longer a Napoleon or a Louis there, who could bring on a war even against the will of the people. Austria and Italy likewise need peace for the healing of their manifold wounds, and this is particularly the case with Russia.

Under such circumstances the conclusions to which all this leads must be made clear. A mutual understanding for the reduction of army and navy expenditures has become an urgent necessity, and the carrying of this out, at least in its beginnings, is possible without delay this very year, although a substantial and progressive reduction of the expenditures would require several years.

We therefore urgently request the members of the Reichstag not only not to undertake to put into effect the proposed increase of taxes, but to make a strong effort to induce the imperial government to issue immediately to the other powers an invitation to a Conference on Disarmament. Where there is a will, there is a way. We beg all statesmen in Germany, and especially all who have the interest of our nation truly at heart, to declare themselves in this sense; and not less do we entreat all friends of peace throughout Europe to bring their influence to bear to the same end upon all the important governments and parliaments. If the armies and the navies could be, by such coöperation, reduced one half, they would still be larger than is necessary for all legitimate purposes. May the world at large be freed from